Remarks

This is in response to the non-final Office Action mailed on December 18, 2003. The specification and claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 13, 15, 21, 28, and 30 have been editorially amended. All of these amendments are to correct typographical errors or other informalities; none of the amendments limit the scope of the claims. Claims 1-30 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

I. Claim Objections

In Section 1 of the Office Action, claims 21, 28, and 30 were objected to based on an informality. Claims 21, 28, and 30 have been amended to address the informality. Removal of the objection is therefore respectfully requested.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In Section 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowlow et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,189,138, in view of Goldberg et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,571,232. It is assumed that claims 19-30, although not listed, are subject to this rejection as well because they are treated in the detailed description of the rejection. The correctness of this rejection is not conceded and is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to method of creating programmable data objects for use in a multi-tier computing architecture. The method recited by claim 1 includes the following:

- dragging a graphical representation for a server processing resource from a server explorer module to a visual design surface module to add a processing item to a programmable data object being created in the visual design surface module;
- identifying data schema associated with the server processing resource added to the programmable data object;
- creating a typed dataset containing the data structures corresponding to the data schema associated with the server processing resource;
- creating a command adapter to provide data transfer commands within the programmable data object between the programmable data object and the server processing resource; and

- creating a data transfer connection between the programmable data object and the server processing resource.

The method of creating programmable data objects recited by claim 1 is advantageous because it allows for the creation of a programming model that can efficiently facilitate communication between clients and servers in a scalable environment.

Fowlow is directed at a tool that can be used to graphically assembly objects distributed across a network to create a new implementation of an object. Fowlow, col. 6, lines 28-37. Fowlow is not directed at, nor even discusses, a database, a schema, or a system for providing access to a database schema.

In contrast, Goldberg is directed at a system for browsing database schema information, including the use of metadata to create a graphical user interface to allow construction of an SQL query. Goldberg, col. 3, lines 26-36.

The rejection states that Fowlow fails to suggest (i) identifying data schema associated with a server processing resource, and (ii) creating a typed dataset containing the data structures corresponding to the data schema associated with the server processing resource, as recited by claim 1. The rejection cites Goldberg as suggesting such steps and states that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the disclosures of Fowlow and Goldberg. This combination is respectfully traversed because there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Fowlow and Goldberg, and it is therefore respectfully suggested that the rejection fails to provide a prima facie case of obviousness.

The possible sources for motivation to combine references are: (a) the nature of problem being solved; (b) the teaching of the prior art; and (c) the knowledge of one skilled in the art. MPEP 2143.01. It is respectfully suggested that, in the present application, none of these sources provide motivation to combine Fowlow and Goldberg for at least the following reasons.

Specifically, Fowlow is directed at the problem of combining objects distributed across a network and does not even disclose or reference a database, while Goldberg is directed specifically at database access. Therefore, the problems being solved by Fowlow and Goldberg are different. Further, neither the disclosure of Fowlow nor Goldberg suggests such a combination for at least the same reasons. In addition, there is no suggestion that one of ordinary skill in the art would combine a Fowlow, a reference dealing with the combination of distributed objects, with Goldberg, a reference directed at providing database access.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully suggested that that combination of Fowlow and Goldberg is improper. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1, as well as claims 2-6 that depend therefrom, are respectfully requested.

Independent claims 7, 13, and 19, although not identical in scope to claim 1, include limitations similar to those noted above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claims 7, 13, and 19, as well as claims 8-12, 14-18, and 20-30 that depend respectively therefrom, should be allowable for at least similar reasons as those provided above with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Please contact the undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: March 17, 2004

Robert A Kalinsky

Name: Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No.: 50,471
RAK